DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 208 EA 017 762

AUTHOR Oliver, Ronald L.
TITLE Teacher Lateral Mobility.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 39p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Mobility; Questionnaires; Research Design; Research Methodology; Research Needs; *Research Utilization; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Employment; *Teacher Transfer; Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Lateral Mobility

ABSTRACT

This paper is a reassessment of an original research project (Oliver, 1980) that analyzed the way teachers had decided on lateral job change (i.e., change from one teaching position to another in the same district without a significant increase in pay). The purpose of the reassessment is to examine how the results obtained from the original research study can be used in the educational environment of the future. The instrumentation of the original study is reexamined for validity and reliability, and the results are clarified. This reexamination analyzes the review of the literature, the instruments, and the method of collecting the data. The original recommendations for further study are also clarified in light of this examination, and suggestions are made regarding future analyses of teacher lateral mobility. Appendixes provide the original instruments (questionnaires for teachers and principals), original hypotheses, and revised instruments. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257208

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ronald L. Oliver

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Teacher Lateral Mobility

Ronald L. Oliver

Northwestern Oklahoma State University

Department of Education

1984

Running Head: TEACHER LATERAL MOBILITY

EA 017 762

Abstract

The purpose of an original research project (Oliver, 1980) was to analyze the way teachers had decided on lateral job change. Lateral job change was defined as a job change by a teacher from one teaching position to another teaching position where the teacher and the past principal were still in the district and where there had not been a large increase in the pay of the teacher due to the job change. The results of the original study are clarified in this report. The purpose of this paper is to reexamine the original instrument for validity and reliability. This reexamination will analyze the review of the literature, the instrument, and the method of collecting the data. There will be a clarification of the original recommendations for further study. Suggestions are made on analyzing teacher lateral mobility in the future.

Teacher Lateral Mobility

The public schools of America constantly face dramatic changes in organizational structure. One problem which has caused schools to change their educational programming has been the declining birth rate which has resulted in declining enrollment. The decrease in school enrollment has triggered educational policy choices by school boards. One of these choices is the relocation of teachers. Teachers need to be prepared to examine the rate of change in the occupational field, to be aware of current educational practices, and to have knowledge of the future goals required of classroom students. In preparing teachers for the future classroom, educators want to know where they fit in the new plan and how the new plan will affect their ability to do their work. Preparing teachers for change leads to teacher lateral mobility which was the focus of a major research experiment by this instructor (Oliver, 1980). The purpose of this paper is to examine how the results obtained from the original research study can be utilized in the educational environment of the future.

The purpose of the original study was to analyze the way teachers had decided on lateral job change. Lateral job change was defined as a job change by a teacher from one teaching position to another teaching position where the teacher and the past principal were still in the district and where there had not been a large increase in the pay of the teacher due to the job change.

More specifically:

A. A thorough review of the literature was conducted dealing with personnel development as it related to lateral employee position change requirements in educational and business environments.

B. Teachers who had made recent lateral job changes were asked how they decided to make the change.

C. School administrators who had faculty making lateral job changes were asked why the teacher made the change and how the teacher decided to make the change.

D. A comparison between teachers who had made recent lateral job changes and school administrators who had faculty make lateral job changes was conducted.

Data for the original research was obtained in the following manner: personnel directors of four large school districts in Kansas (Salina, Hutchinson, Junction City, and Manhattan) were contacted for a personal conference with the researcher. The purpose of this conferences was to obtain a list of all the teachers in the district who had moved laterally within the 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 school years and to obtain permission for carrying out the research project in the districts. Principals of teachers who had made lateral job changes were contacted for purposes of arranging conferences with these teachers and principals. Teachers were contacted for appointments with the researcher for the purpose of obtaining data for the study. The answers given by teachers and principals as to why there were lateral job moves were recorded. One hundred forty teachers and one hundred forty principals served as the sample. The study did not include out-of-district transfer teachers or

principals, and the study did not include teachers going into administrative positions. There was an assumption that teachers and principals gave correct answers to why there were lateral job movements and did not falsify any information. There was an assumption that the instrument correctly identified the information needed for the study. The original instrument is listed in Appendix A of this paper. The instrument was developed to serve as a research tool in an interview situation. Standardized information was collected from a predetermined population. Each item on the instrument was developed to measure a specific aspect of the hypotheses or objectives.

All teachers were asked a series of five demographic questions and ten openended questions. Principals were not asked any demographic questions, but were asked the same ten openended questions asked of teachers.

Eight hypotheses were developed. Hypotheses numbers 1,2, and 3 were tested by the responses given by teachers and principals to openended question number 9. Hypotheses numbers 4,5,6,7, and 8 were tested by the responses given by teachers to the demographic questions.

Hypotheses are listed in Appendix B of this paper. All responses were tested by the chi-square statistical technique, and all data analyzed using the .05 level of significance.

The results of the original study are clarified in this report.

Review of the Literature

The original review of the literature concentrated on four general areas: initial employment and interview procedures, business and industrial programs with reference to retraining and personnel development programs, job movement in government, and job movement in education.

Prediction was important because the organization needed to know if the selection of the applicant could be dependent upon factors deemed necessary by the organization for training purposes. Reliability and validity of interview techniques were deemded essential. Individual traits of the potential employee were often the key to his/her employment. Research findings were available to help both the interviewer and the interviewee in the formal interview setting. In the business community the organization put emphasis on the tools possessed by the applicant before the first job.

In government, communications was cited as a major problem in relationship to job possibilities. People in government often were not aware of job possibilities due to no communication from the organizational leaders. The importance of long-term and short-term training was cited in research findings. Research findings with emphasis on job movement possibilities were cited at the local and government levels.

The major problem facing education was declining enrollment. Fewer students meant less teachers. If personnel in education were going to move laterally, development programs must have been available to them for preparing for a possible job change. Preparing teachers for new positions could be through course work at a university or through personnel development programs within the local school district. The literature verified the need for in-service training.

Government, business, and education were all faced with the problem of how best to prepare employees for possible job movement within the organization. Research findings indicated that these agencies did care about their employees and were making an attempt to utilize the talents of the employees with maximum benefits for the employees and the employer.

Research in reviewing the literature should continue to place emphasis on the four general areas of concentration in the original study.

Chronological Age

Results from the original study regarding chronological age were as follows:

Chronological Age	Number of Teachers	Percentage
21-24	4	2.9
25-29	34	24.3
30 and older	102	72.8
Total	140	100.0

There is a low number of teachers in the age category of 21-24 years. This category could be combined with the category of 25-29 years. An arbitrary category could be the next ten years. With the aim of having equal participants per category the following new demographic chart is proposed regarding chronological age:

Category One: 21 to 29 years

Category Two: 30 to 40 years

Category Three: 41 years and older

Sex

Results from the original study regarding sex were as follows:

Sex	Number of Teachers	Percentage
Male	23	16.4
Female	117	83.6
Total	140	100.0

Although there was a small percentage of males when compared to females, the two categories should remain the same as in the original study:

Category One: Male

Category Two: Female

Teaching Experience

Results from the original study regarding teaching experience in the district were as follows:

Teaching Experience	Number of Teachers	Percentage
1 or 2 years	3	2.1
3 or 4 years	29	20.7
5 or more years	108	77.2
Total	140	100.0

There is a low number of teachers in the 1 to 2 years category. Results infer non-tenured teachers are not making lateral mobility changes. The first two categories should be combined. An arbitrary second category should go through the tenth year. With the aim of having equal participants per category the following new demographic chart is proposed regarding teaching experience:

Category One: one to four years

Category Two: five to ten years

Category Three: eleven years and longer

Educational Degree

Results from the original study regarding educational degree were as follows:

Educational Degree	Number of Teachers	Percentage
Bachelor's	52	37.1
Master's	64	45.8
Master's Plus 30	24	17.1
Total	140	100.0

Results infer even distribution, considering the possible categories, for educational degree. The three categories should remain the same as in the original study:

Category One: Bachelor's Degree

Category Two: Master's Degree

Category Three: Master's Degree plus 30 semester hours

Job Titles and Building Changes

Results from the original study regarding job titles and building changes were as follows:

Teaching Level	Number of Teachers	Percentage
Elementary	117	83.6
Secondary	23	16.4
Total	140	100.0

Change Category	Number of Teachers	Percentage
Building Change	91	65.0
No Building Change	49	35.0
Total	140	100.0

Present Position	Number of Teachers	Percentage
Lower Elementary (K-3)	38	27.1
Upper Elementary (4-6)	36	25.8
Elementary (Specialized)	43	30.7
Secondary (Academic)	13	9.3
Secondary (Specialized)	10	7.1
Total	140	100.0

Past Position	Number of Teachers	Percentage
Lower Elementary (K-3)	32	22.8
Upper Elementary (4-6)	53	37.9
Elementary (Specialized)	33	23.6
Secondary (Academic)	16	11.4
Secondary (Specialized)	6	4.3
Total	140	100.0

The categories should remain the same as in the original study:

What is your current job title?

What was your past job title?

Did you change buildings?

Reasons for Teacher Lateral Mobility

The following reasons were given by teachers and principals for teacher lateral mobility:

(1) teacher requested a change

(2) principal requested a change

(3) declining enrollment

(4) school closed

(5) teacher wanted a different subject or grade

(6) teacher-principal differences

(7) teacher-teacher differences

(8) teacher gained additional hours

(9) closer to home

Reasons given by teachers and principals for teacher lateral mobility were grouped into the nine areas listed above in the original research project. Additional research activities might wish to examine if reasons for teacher lateral mobility are the same as or similar to the original nine reasons.

Recommendations for Further Study

The focus of the original research project was to examine the way teachers decided on lateral job changes. Teachers who had made recent job changes were surveyed to determine their reasons for changing positions. School administrators who had faculty making lateral job changes were asked how the orientation for the change was provided.

The research findings indicated that teachers, principals, and teachers and principals probably did not agree on the reason for the lateral job change of the teacher. However, there were no significantly different reasons given for lateral job movement and the chronological age of the teacher, the sex of the teacher, the teaching experience of the teacher, the educational degree of the teacher, and the past teaching position of the teacher.

If the original study were to be replicated, the demographic classifications could be changed to see if there would be significantly different reasons for lateral job movement and teachers.

The sample base for the original research project was four large school districts in Kansas (Salina, Hutchinson, Junction City, and Manhattan). The study could duplicated by using districts other than the ones used in the original study, by using a larger number of districts, or by examining teachers who make lateral mobility changes in one district in a large city. There probably would be room for investigating lateral job changes in smaller districts, but there would not be the number of teachers available in small districts when compared to other districts for size alone.

Specifically in applying this research to personnel management one could conclude that at the present time there is no organized effort on the part of management to help teachers prepare for lateral job mobility; infer that elementary school and secondary school teachers do not move laterally for the same reasons; infer that elementary school and secondary school principals do not believe that their teachers move laterally for the same reasons; infer that elementary and secondary school teachers do not move laterally for the same reasons as documented by their past

principal; conclude that additional research is needed in the area of examining the reasons for teacher lateral job movement in the public schools of Kansas; research each of the general areas given by teachers and principals as the primary reason for teacher lateral job movement.

Teacher lateral mobility is a prime area that has not been researched in any major way by personnel officers or school administrators.

Summary

The following suggestions may be useful to researchers evaluating teacher lateral mobility.

Introduction to the Problem

The problem is the process by which teachers decide on lateral job changes. Both teachers and their past principals should be asked why there was teacher lateral mobility. If possible, all teachers should be interviewed first and then principals. This prevents external variables from influencing the researcher during the formal interviews.

Separate letters should be given to personnel directors, building principals, and teachers to clarify the reason for the study. Teachers and principals should be interviewed on a one-to-one basis on a prearranged basis. At least one week notification should be given for interview times. Individuals should be coded for administrative purposes.

An outside person should do the actual interviewing. This should be a non-district employee, preferably someone from higher education with experience and expertise in research methodology. Also, public school personnel are not likely to place confidence in one of their peers for purposes of confidentiality in studies of this nature. Interviews should be conducted in the home school of the teacher or building principal and should not be tape recorded.

The original study was limited to four large districts in Kansas. A total of 140 teachers and 140 principals took part in the study. This number of participants appeared to be satisfactory for the research design. The larger the districts the less number of districts will be required for a satisfactory number of subjects. A minimum of 100 teachers and 100 administrators is needed for evaluating teacher lateral mobility.

Teachers moving into administrative positions were not included in the original research project. Neither were teachers moving out of the district. These two areas could be explored in future research.

A Review of the Literature

The original review of the literature concentrated on those general relevant areas which had reference to lateral job movement. These areas included the initial employment and interview procedures, business and industrial programs with reference to retraining and personnel development programs, job movement in government and job movement in education. These four areas can be taken separately and examined in depth. There is the possibility of adding other areas depending on the purpose of the research.

Initial employment and interview procedures can be evaluated at levels including public education, higher education, vocational education, private education, the business community, and governmental workers. Business and industrial programs with reference to retraining and personnel development programs could be explored using an international data base. Job movement in government can be clarified at the local, state, national, and international scale. Job movement in education is not adequately researched for practical purposes.

Method and Procedures

The purpose of the study should be to examine the way teachers decide on lateral job changes. Researchers should pay particular attention to the sample, sample size, instrumentation, reliability, validity, the instrument, administration of the instrument, hypotheses, and method of analysis.

Little research was reported in the literature concerning job movement. In conducting a literature search no existing instrument was found already developed for researching teacher lateral job mobility. An openended instrument was developed to serve as a research tool in an interview situation. Standardized information was collected from a predetermined population. Each item on the instrument was developed to measure a specific aspect of the hypotheses or objectives. Suggestions for revising the research tool are clarified in this paper.

The instrument used for purposes of this research project was an openended instrument. The instrument was administered in a one-to-one situation with teachers and principals. Teachers and principals were interviewed

separately. The questions were read by the researcher to the participants. Teachers were interviewed in their own classrooms, and principals were interviewed in their offices. The responses given by teachers and principals to the questions were recorded by the researcher on a separate sheet per participant. The researcher recorded no information while teachers and principals were answering the questions. All participants were given the chance to see and verify the correctness of their responses as recorded by the researcher at the conclusion of the personal interviews. The responses of teachers and principals were confidential. The average length of each interview was approximately 10 minutes per participant. The reason for any variation of this time was that some participants wished to expand on their answers while other participants answered the questions with a limited response.

Administration of the instrument was divided into three separate phases: obtaining permission for approval of the project and obtaining basic information from district central office personnel directors; setting up individual conferences with teachers and principals through each building principal; collecting the data by arranging for individual interviews with teachers and principals.

The specific hypotheses were stated in the null form. Additional hypotheses may be added to the original eight.

All responses were tested by the chi-square statistical technique, and all data analyzed using the .05 level of significance. This research statistic is appropriate when utilizing non-parametric data. Individual categories were developed after completion of the collection of the individual response sheets, and respondents were not asked to answer to a specific category.

Analysis of Data

There was 100% response to all questions by teachers and principals. No teacher or administrator refused to respond to any question. Tables should be constructed to include responses to the demographic questions asked of teachers and to the openended questions asked of teachers and principals. The demographic tables should include the table number, title, category, number of teachers, percentage of teachers, and totals. The openended tables should include

the table number, title, subjects, reasons, totals, and a clarification of the hypotheses, alpha level, degrees of freedom, region of rejection, computed chi-square, and acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses. A summary of the findings should include a discussion of significantly different associations and no significant associations.

Results and Conclusions

This section should include a discussion of the problem, the purposes and objectives of the study, procedure, results, hypotheses, opended questions, conclusions, utility of the findings, and recommendations for further study.

Appendix A (Original Instrument)

(TEACHERS) Demographic Information

1. Which of the following categories contains your chronological age?

   Category One: 21 to 24 years
   Category Two: 25 to 29 years
   Category Three: 30 years and older

2. Which of the following categories contains your sex?

   Category One: Male
   Category Two: Female

3. Which of the following categories contains your teaching experience in the district?

   Category One: one or two years
   Category Two: three or four years
   Category Three: five years or longer

4. Which of the following categories contains your formal education?

   Category One: Bachelor's Degree
   Category Two: Master's Degree
   Category Three: Master's Degree plus 30 semester hours

5. What is your current job title?
   What was your past job title?
   Did you change buildings?

Appendix A (Original Instrument)

(TEACHERS) Openended Questions

1. What were the reasons you changed positions?
2. How were you involved in this change?
3. How was the administration involved in this change?
4. What were the circumstances leading up to this change?
5. What were the retraining requirements for this job movement?
6. At what point for sure did you know that you would be changing positions?
7. On a scale of one (low) to ten (high) how do you feel about this move?
8. On a scale of one (low) to ten (high) how does your past principal feel about this move?
9. What was the most important reason you changed positions?
10. Are there any other items that you wish to discuss concerning this position change?

Appendix A (Original Instrument)

(PRINCIPALS) Openended Questions

1. What were the reasons _____ changed positions?
2. How was the teacher involved in this change?
3. How were you involved in this change?
4. What were the circumstances leading up to this change?
5. What were the retraining requirements for this job movement?
6. At what point for sure did the teacher know that he/she would be changing positions?
7. On a scale of one (low) to ten (high) how does the teacher feel about the move?
8. On a scale of one (low) to ten (high) how do you feel about the move?
9. What was the most important reason the teacher changed positions?
10. Are there any other items that you wish to discuss concerning this position change?

Appendix B (Original Hypotheses)

Hypothesis number 1 stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for lateral job movement of elementary school and secondary school teachers.

Hypothesis number 2 stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for lateral job movement according to elementary school and secondary school principals.

Hypothesis number 3 stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for teacher lateral job movement according to elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

Hypothesis number 4 stated that there would be no significant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the chronological age of the teacher.

Hypothesis number 5 stated that there would be no significant difference betweent the reasons given for lateral job movement by the sex of the teacher.

Hypothesis number 6 stated that there would be no significant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the teaching experience in the district of the teacher.

Hypothesis number 7 stated that there would be no significant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the educational degree of the teacher.

Hypothesis number 8 stated that there would be no significant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the past teaching position of the teacher.

Appendix C (Revised Instrument)

(TEACHERS) Demographic Information

1. Which of the following categories contains your chronological age?

   Category One: 21 to 29 years
   Category Two: 30 to 40 years
   Category Three: 41 years and older

2. Which of the following categories contains your sex?

   Category One: Male
   Category Two: Female

3. Which of the following categories contains your teaching experience in the district?

   Category One: one to four years
   Category Two: five to ten years
   Category Three: eleven years and longer

4. Which of the following categories contains your formal education?

   Category One: Bachelor's Degree
   Category Two: Master's Degree
   Category Three: Master's Degree plus 30 semester hours

5. What is your current job title?
   What was your past job title?
   Did you change buildings?

Appendix C (Revised Instrument)

(TEACHERS) Openended Questions

1. What were the reasons you changed positions?
2. How were you involved in this change?
3. How was your past principal involved in this change?
4. What were the circumstances leading up to this change?
5. What were the retraining requirements for this job movement?
6. At what point for sure did you know that you would be changing positions?
7. On a scale of one (low) to five (high) how do you feel now about this move?
8. On a scale of one (low) to five (high) how does your past principal feel now about this move?
9. What was the most important reason you changed positions?
10. Are there any other items that you wish to discuss concerning this position change?

Appendix C (Revised Instrument)

(PRINCIPALS) Openended Questions

1. What were the reasons _____ changed positions?
2. How was the teacher involved in this change?
3. How were you involved in this change?
4. What were the circumstances leading up to this change?
5. What were the retraining requirements for this job movement?
6. At what point for sure did the teacher know that he/she would be changing positions?
7. On a scale of one (low) to five (high) how does the teacher feel now about this move?
8. On a scale of one (low) to five (high) how do you feel now about this move?
9. What was the most important reason the teacher changed positions?
10. Are there any other items that you wish to discuss concerning this position change?

ABSTRACT

Teachers must be prepared to accept lateral job change. How were teachers prepared for lateral job change? How were administrators orienting teachers to prepare for the dramatic change in jobs? These questions had not been adequately answered in the literature. Therefore, teachers who had made recent job changes were surveyed to find out how they decided to change. School administrators who had faculty making lateral job changes were asked how the orientation for the change was provided.

A review of the literature concentrated on those general relevant areas which had reference to lateral job movement: initial employment and interview procedures, business and industrial programs with reference to retraining and personnel development programs, job movement in government, and job movement in education.

The sample was limited to four large school districts in Kansas. All teachers in the districts who had moved laterally during the school years of 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 and their past principals were interviewed. A total of 140 teachers and 45 principals (some principals had more than one teacher participating in the interviews) took part in the research project.

An openended instrument was developed to serve as a research tool in an interview situation. All teachers were asked a series of five demographic questions, and were asked the same ten openended questions asked of administrators.

A series of eight hypotheses were developed and tested at the .05 level of significance. By using a chi-square test of independence, it was concluded that there was a significantly different association between elementary school and secondary school teachers and the reason given for lateral job movement. It was concluded that there was a significantly different association between elementary school and secondary school principals and the reason given for lateral job movement. There was a significantly different association between the reason given for lateral job movement and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. However, there was no significantly different association between the reason given for the lateral job change and the chronological age of the teacher, the sex of the teacher, the teaching experience in the district of the teacher, the educational degree of the teacher, and the past teaching position of the teacher.

A total of ten openended questions were asked of teachers and principals concerning lateral job movement. It was concluded, through a chi-square test of independence with an alpha equal to .05, that there was a significantly different association between teachers and principals and the initial reason given for the lateral job change, the amount of involvement by the teacher in the change, the cirucumstances surrounding the change, the feeling of the teacher towards the change, the feeling of the principal towards the change, the most important reason for the change, and the chance to add additional items to the interview. Teachers and principals did not significantly disagree on the amount of involvement by the principal in the change, the amount of retraining needed for the change, and the notification date that there would be a lateral job change for the teacher.

Declining enrollment and school closings were important variables at the elementary school level, but not at the secondary school level.

In summary, through an analysis of the findings of this study, there was a significantly different association between the reason given for lateral job movement and teachers, principals, and teachers and principals.

References

Oliver, R.L. (1980). The analysis of teacher lateral mobility within selected public school districts. Doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University.